

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks and amendments. Claims 1 and 6 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 are pending in the application.

### **I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0140867 filed by Weiss (hereinafter "Weiss") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,315,579 issued to Karaoguz (hereinafter "Karaoguz") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,744,822 issued to Gaddam et al. (hereinafter "Gaddam").

Claim 1, as amended, recites the elements of "the TCM encoder includes a first feedback loop to initialize the memory of the TCM encoder after receiving the values stored in the memory of the TCM encoder from the first switching unit," and "the precoder includes a second feedback loop to initialize the memory of the precoder after receiving the values stored in the memory of the precoder from the second switching unit." Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in Fig. 8 and page 12, lines 4-11 of the Specification. In the Office Action, the Examiner has conceded that Weiss fails to teach or suggest the elements related to the TCM encoder and the precoder including respective switching units as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Weiss fails to teach or suggest the above cited elements in amended claim 1 as well.

Further, Karaoguz fails to teach or suggest the above missing cited elements. Although Karaoguz discloses a TCM (Trellis Coded Modulation) encoder including two switching units, the TCM encoder uses a *single feedback loop* in Fig. 16 to initialize registers 131, 133 and 135. See Karaoguz, column 10, line 38 to column 11, line 6. Thus, Karaoguz fails to teach or suggest the elements related to "a first feedback loop" and "a second feedback loop" as recited in amended claim 1.

In addition, Gaddam fails to teach or suggest the above cited missing elements of amended claim 1. In contrast, as shown in Fig. 3 of Gaddam, trellis encoder 300 includes respective switches for bits  $z_0$ ,  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  that provide values for *mapper 150* (i.e., not the memory of the TCM encoder and the precoder) instead of performing the elements of "initialize

the memory of the TCM encoder after receiving the values stored in the memory of the TCM encoder from the first switching unit,” and “initialize the memory of the precoder after receiving the values stored in the memory of the precoder from the second switching unit,” as recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, Applicants also note that the input signals shown in Fig. 3 are from device 310 instead of from the first or second switching units as recited in amended claim 1.

As a result, for at least the above reasons, Weiss in view of Karaoguz in further view of Gaddam fails to teach or suggest each element of amended claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claims 3-5, each of these claims depends on base claim 1 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, in view of at least the previous reasons discussed in connection with amended claim 1, Weiss in view of Karaoguz in further view of Gaddam fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 3-5. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-5 are respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claim 6, this claim has been amended to recite analogous elements to those discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. Thus, amended claim 6 is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons discussed above. In addition, dependent claims 8-10 are patentable over the art of record because each of these claims depends on base claim 6.

With respect to dependent claims 8-10, each of these claims depends on base claim 6 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, in view of at least the previous reasons discussed in connection with claim 6, Weiss in view of Karaoguz in further view of Gaddam fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 8-10. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-10 are respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207 3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 8/28, 2008

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(310) 207-3800

Eric S. Hyman  
Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

### CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on August 28, 2008.

Christine Flores  
Christine Flores August 28, 2008